



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,973	07/18/2003	Daniel J. Zillig	58067US002	.3008
32692	7590	02/22/2007		
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			EXAMINER MATZEK, MATTHEW D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com
LegalDocketing@mmm.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/622,973

Applicant(s)

ZILLIG ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew D. Matzek

Art Unit

1771

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-10, 12-36, 47, 49, 51 and 52.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


**NORCA TORRES
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Willman does not support Examiner's interpretation that the applied reference implicitly teaches that the intermediate region of the applied article contains more adhesive than its surface. Applicant has provided a definition for "impregnated", which includes the description of to be filled or saturated. Examiner has interpreted the applied reference to have the same meaning. Examiner has interpreted the applied reference to have more adhesive in the interior of the article than at its exterior face because throughout the Willman reference the inventors clearly teach that they want the adhesive minimized at the exterior so as to minimize or eliminate any adverse effects [0178], while the article is saturated/impregnated with the same adhesive. Examiner further supports this position in that the interior adhesive is to trap and retain dirt and other particles, that may come free through subsequent use [0178], which would lead one to infer that the adhesive level must be greater at the interior than at its exterior face if the interior adhesive has been relied upon for soil retention. Examiner also draws support for the fact that the applied reference teaches that the adhesive may be applied in "zones", which allow for areas of varied adhesive on the face of the wiping article [0184]. If the article is in fact impregnated or saturated as taught by Willman, the interior would be filled with adhesive and the lesser "zones" would have lower levels of adhesive at their exposed face than in the "zones" of greater adhesive. These lesser "zones" would in turn have less adhesive than the impregnated body thereby meeting the instant limitation set forth in claim 1. Applicant argues that Examiner has improperly relied upon Truong by not considering the reference as a whole and by viewing the reference as a whole the disclosed Drag Values have no meaning or applicability to cleaning wipe constructions having an exposed tacky material, since none of the examples of Truong have an exposed tacky surface. Applicant is directed to paragraph 0004 of Truong which teaches a cleaning article exhibiting high drag is particularly disadvantageous and with each push and pull movement the user makes with said cleaning element the user must exert extra effort to overcome the drag at the contact area. Thus it is disadvantageous to create an article with high drag values. Therefore, one would look to the prior art of cleaning elements, such as mops (Willman is a dry mop) to ascertain the appropriate drag values. This is what Examiner has done in relying upon Truong.